

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are requested. Applicant requests entry of the above amendments and new claims 11-16, at which point claims 1 - 16 will be pending.

Rejection of Claims 1-10 Under Section 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-10 under Section 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,208,966 to Bulfer (“Bulfer”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that Bulfer do not anticipate or teach each element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites a voice-operated arrangement for interacting with a DTMF-controlled system. Applicant submits that there are at least one limitation of claim 1 not taught or suggested by Bulfer. For example, claim 1 recites a voice-operated arrangement for interacting with a DTMF controlled system. The second element is a speech-to-DTMF tones application, responsive to the digital signal outputs from the speech recognition unit for accessing a proper user record from a plurality of user records. The Examiner asserts that col. 3, lines 10-25 teaches this limitation.

Applicant traverses the Examiner’s interpretation of this portion of Bulfer. In this portion of Bulfer, he states that “conventional speech recognition techniques” are used to determine the sequence of digits comprising a telephone number given by a caller. Notably, in this portion of Bulfer, he does not mention accessing a user record and further does not mention or suggest accessing a user record from a plurality of user records. This portion of Bulfer merely describes a process of the user providing a

telephone number to a server, the telephone number being associated with a service such as a voice mail system or a banking service.

For at least the above reason, Applicant submits that Bulfer simply fails to disclose this element of claim 1. More reasons follow.

Claim 1 further requires retrieving dial-out information for a DTMF-controlled system associated with the user and completing a communication path between the user and the associated DTMF-controlled system. Bulfer's disclosed system requires the user to provide a telephone number manually, either by dialing or by orally providing a telephone number for the automated system for which touch-tone control is desired. Col. 3, lines 10-25. This step is cumbersome for the user. The invention of claim 1 differs inasmuch as the speech-to-DTMF tone application accesses a user record and retrieves dial-out information for the DTMF-controlled system. This eliminates the need for the user to manually input a telephone number to the DTMF-controlled system. The teachings of Bulfer are further highlighted by the flow diagram of FIG. 2, steps 22 - 24. Step 22 requires the system to instruct the caller to provide a telephone number for an automated system. Step 23 discloses "receiving the telephone number" and then step 24 requires requesting a second line from the network and dial number of automated system. The present invention provides a plurality of user records from which dial-out information is retrieved.

Therefore, Bulfer requires the user to manually input a telephone number associated with a DTMF controlled system. Since the invention of claim 1 requires accessing a user record and retrieving dial-out information from the user record for the DTMF-controlled system associated with the user, it provides a different and improved method associated with speech-DTMF conversion. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Bulfer and in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 - 7 depend from claim 1 and recite further limitations therefrom. Accordingly, inasmuch as parent claim 1 is patentable over Bulfer, Applicant submits that claims 2 - 7 are patentable as well. Several specific comments are warranted.

Claim 4 recites a plurality of different DTMF-controlled systems are associated with a user and the user record comprises a plurality of different field for each DTMF-controlled system. As discussed above, Bulfer fails to teach user records from which dial-out information is retrieved. Therefore, since Bulfer fails to teach user records as defined in claim 1, then the further limitation of claim 4 that defines in more detail the components within the user records cannot be taught by Bulfer. The Examiner asserts that Bulfer at col. 3, lines 10 - 25 discloses a plurality of DTMF-controlled systems each with different fields. The Examiner's analysis, however, does not address the specific claim limitation which requires user records to contain a plurality of different fields for each DTMF system of the plurality of DTMF-controlled systems. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over Bulfer. The above arguments can also apply to claims 5 - 7 as well to further support their patentability.

The Examiner asserts that claim 8 is taught by Bulfer as well. Claim 8 recites a method for interacting with at least one DTMF-controlled telecommunications system, the method comprises retrieving a proper user record of the user, and dialing out to a DTMF-controlled system included in the retrieved user record. As discussed above, Bulfer fails to disclose the limitation of retrieving a user record and dialing out to a DTMF-controlled system included in the user record. Bulfer teaches instructing the user to manually input a telephone number of the DTMF system. For this reason, Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 10 each depend on claim 8 and recite further limitations therefrom. These claims are therefore patentable inasmuch as the parent claim is patentable. Applicant submits that claims 9 and 10 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

New Claims 11-16

Applicant submits that new claims 11 - 16 also recite limitations not taught by the prior art of record and requests a Notice of Allowance for these claims as well as claims 1 - 10.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed the rejection of claims 1 - 10 and requested entry of claims 11 - 16, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/8/01


by Thomas M. Isaacson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: (410) 414-3056

Correspondence Address:

Samuel Dworetzky
AT&T Corp.
P.O. Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748